1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
3	SOUTHERN DIVISION
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
5	Plaintiff, No: 1:23mj230
6	vs.
7	ANDREW BLAIR HOWARD,
8	Defendant.
9	
10	Before:
11	THE HONORABLE RAY KENT U.S. Magistrate Judge
12	Grand Rapids, Michigan Tuesday, June 25, 2025
13	Sentence Proceedings
14	APPEARANCES:
15	MR. MARK A. TOTTEN, U.S. ATTORNEY By: MS. LAUREN BIKSACKY
16	MS. MEAGAN JOHNSON 330 Ionia Avenue, NW
17	Suite 501 Grand Rapids, MI 49503
18	(616) 456-2404
19	On behalf of the Plaintiff;
20	MR. ANTHONY J. VALENTINE 227 Federal Square Building
21	29 Pearl Street, NW Grand Rapids, MI 49503
22	(616) 288-5410
23	On behalf of the Defendant.
24	Also Present: Scott Dekkers, NPS.
25	REPORTED BY: MR. PAUL G. BRANDELL, CSR-4552, RPR, CRR

06/25/2024

(Proceedings, 2:00 p.m.)

THE CLERK: United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan is now in session. The Honorable Ray Kent, United States Magistrate Judge, presiding. Please be seated.

THE COURT: This is 23mj230, United States versus

Andrew Howard. Ms. Biksacky, Ms. Johnson on behalf of the

United States. Mr. Valentine on behalf of Mr. Howard. This is

the time and place set for sentencing in this matter.

Following a bench trial on February 7 I found Mr. Howard guilty of one count of tampering and one count of vandalism as charged in the Class B information. The maximum sentence that I could impose upon conviction of those offenses is imprisonment for not more than six months, a fine of not more than \$5,000, probation of not more than five years, a mandatory special assessment in the amount of \$10, restitution and the cost of proceedings.

I did not order a presentence investigation or the preparation of a presentence report in this matter.

The parties have filed voluminous documents directed at sentencing, including the government's opening sentencing memorandum, which is at ECF 20, Defendant's opening memorandum, ECF 21, the Defendant's response to the government's opening, ECF 22, the government's reply brief to that, ECF 24,

Defendant's surreply brief at ECF 25, and a notice of updated restitution costs filed by the government at ECF 27. I have read all of those documents and their attachments.

In order to perhaps not spend time unnecessarily, I want the parties to know that I do not intend to rule on whether the mandatory victim's restitution act applies. The parties made reasoned arguments for and against application of the act in their filings, but it's unnecessary for my decision.

All right. Who will be speaking on behalf of the United States?

MS. BIKSACKY: Your Honor, I would briefly address the nonmonetary penalties and then hand over the duration of the argument, if the Court is amenable, to Ms. Johnson, who is in charge of our financial litigation department at our office and who will address the monetary issues.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MS. BIKSACKY: Because this was a bench trial, I am fully aware that the Court was present for and fully understood all of the evidence that came in at trial and so I won't belabor much of the proofs as it relates to sentencing, but instead, focus on what the government believes would be an appropriate and adequate sentence based on the seriousness of the conduct that the Court did hear the evidence for.

So in this case, although intent was not required to be shown as an element of the offense, I think the evidence

more than adequately established that the Defendant intended to take the actions he did and intended to alter the course of the river, and we saw him do so with a shovel that he purposefully bought for that purpose. We saw him do that over an extended period of time both in moving the rocks, and in his words, enhancing the original trench, and so the government believes that this was not a mere accidental issue that could be written off, but that some sort of, in this case, probationary sentence, would be appropriate here.

The government is not --

MR. VALENTINE: Excuse me. I apologize. I did not hear one word. Some sort of what?

MS. BIKSACKY: Some sort of probationary sentence.

MR. VALENTINE: Thank you.

MS. BIKSACKY: Some sort of probationary sentence would be appropriate. In this case the government is not seeking a period of detention. We would ask either for a supervised or unsupervised probationary sentence at the Court's discretion, and what the government is really interested in and the National Park Service is really interested in, is a potential ban. And I have consulted with AUSAs and law enforcement officers from other national parks in the country, including Yellow Stone National Park, and I learned from them that one thing that they commonly ask for and that they commonly receive in situations involving damage to our national

resources, is a ban for the period of probation, and I do not anticipate any issues upholding that ban. And so we would ask that whatever -- if, indeed, the Court does impose a probationary sentence, it would include a ban for Mr. Howard accessing or going upon National Park Service land, which would include the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lake Shore.

Now, I understand that sometimes boundaries are not always clear. They may involve some highways or different thoroughfares driving through a region, and that Mr. Howard does have a vacation home up north by the Platte River, and so the government's request — and this is not meant to impose anything unduly restrictive on his travel around the county or things of that nature, but really aimed at curbing his conduct and imposing a penalty for his conduct.

We know from the trial that he is an avid fisherman. He referred to the Platte River as his home river. He indicated he had a special parking permit or residence near the river, and I have spoken with the National Park Service. They have observed Mr. Howard fishing in the area already this year. And so the government thinks that imposing a ban from Mr. Howard accessing the National Park Service land at Sleeping Bear Dunes would, in essence, show Mr. Howard that he can't take the actions that he did and then expect to reap the benefits of those ill-advised actions.

And so with the ban, Mr. Howard would then necessarily

need to travel north or south to access Lake Michigan for his fishing. It wouldn't be the most direct route, because as the Court heard, the most direct route is through that river where the channel emerged. And this would provide some deterrence, both for Mr. Howard and others, and make sure that Coho Andy is not fishing for coho on National Park Service land that he damaged.

And so with that, Your Honor, I would pass the microphone to Ms. Johnson, unless the Court has any questions regarding probation?

THE COURT: I don't. Thank you.

MS. BIKSACKY: Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: Hello, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Hello.

MS. JOHNSON: We are here this afternoon -- and I know Your Honor said that you did not intend to impose mandatory restitution so I'll leave those arguments aside.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: But we are here because Mr. Howard committed an offense against the United States because he had a policy dispute, and he took those matters into his own hands and frankly cost a lot of financial damage to the park, to the coast guard, and -- and to the government for those. And apart from the mandatory restitution statute --

THE COURT: Yeah. The parties agree I can impose

restitution as a condition of probation.

MS. JOHNSON: Correct. So under 3563(b) the Court has the discretion to impose restitution. That discretionary imposition looks initially whether the Court should impose restitution at all, and then once the Court decides to impose restitution it should impose restitution for the full amount of the victim's losses under 3664. So that's how that statutory scheme goes.

We submitted costs for the National Park Service restitution costs of \$12,868 that was caused when Defendant -- after the damage to the river caused significant ecological harm to the wetlands, to the flow of the river. And the National Park Service dispatched employees. It dispatched hydrologists. It spent a lot of time and money trying to figure out if any of those -- if any of the wildlife needed to be rehabilitated, if the -- if the river needed to be rehabilitated, and the cost to the wildlife if -- if the river was rehabilitated.

And at the end of that investigation it was determined that the cost to the wildlife, to the -- those endangered species and plants would be too significant because of the disruption -- additional disruption to the land, and so they decided to leave the river be, but it doesn't mean that it doesn't cost a significant amount of money and time and resources that the United States Government would not have had

to spend had Mr. Howard not taken those actions into his own hands, which is what he did here.

They had -- you know, the coast guard spent time and money and fuel flying. That is a loss of property that was spent that the government wouldn't have spent otherwise, the resources. And the case law is clear that when a government is spending money to fix harm that was foreseeably caused by his conduct, that that harm can be compensated through restitution, and the United States would ask that that harm be repaired because I think that by not doing that, not just in

Mr. Howard's case, but for others who would want to take the law into their own hands for policy disputes, they might believe that the punishment of probation or a park ban is worth the cost of their crime.

In addition, the statute 1865 has sort of a unique provision for cost of proceedings that's not commonly incurred in criminal statutes, but it says the Court shall impose those costs, and we submitted costs from the travel expenses for the rangers to travel to the trial and for the costs that the government spent having witnesses come to this trial, and so those are the costs of proceedings that the United States would request that the cost impose.

In our notice -- updated notice we put a chart in there that has the different expenses on the reasoning for those with, you know, the payees for those expenses. And so

the United States would -- would ask that those costs be imposed.

Before I conclude, are there any specific areas that the Court would like me to address? Our briefing is voluminous but if there is anything that the Court is particularly concerned about I can address that.

THE COURT: I thought I understood you to say just now that you were seeking restitution in the amount of \$12,000 and some. I thought it was 22,000.

MS. JOHNSON: It's 12,000 for the National Park
Service, 9,000 for the costs that the Coast Guard incurred. So
it's \$22,472 total. I apologize if I omitted that.

Sure. So the National Park Service cost is \$12,868 that they incurred. The coast guard spent an additional \$9,603.93 for a total restitution request of \$22,472.22. For cost of proceedings we are requesting for the ranger travel \$2,113.07, the trial travel expenses of --

THE COURT: You don't need to break it down individually. That's okay.

MS. JOHNSON: Any further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't. Thank you. Mr. Valentine.

MR. VALENTINE: Thank you, Your Honor. For the court reporters benefit I can state the amount of restitution that I think the Defendant is obligated to pay in this matter. I can state it really clearly. It's zero, for the reasons that we

included in our briefs, and I am not sure where we stand on that issue. Costs incidentally are a different issue and we don't quarrel with the government's assessment or excuse me their estimated — their submissions regarding costs. I think those are clearly recoverable. I think that as best I could find, costs would be what they put in their memo.

But I do want to clarify one thing, and that is that on the restitution issue it appears to me as though the Court has, I am not sure, an idea as to where it's going with that or does not.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. VALENTINE: And thus doesn't need to hear any further argument that was included in our submissions. By that I mean all of the parties' submissions.

THE COURT: Correct. On the mandatory victim restitution act issue. I made a decision not to go there.

MR. VALENTINE: Thank you, Your Honor.

Inasmuch as the government has set forth a condition of probation that it wants the Court to impose, which was the primary -- primary subject of their -- their comments, I want to reply to that first.

And that is that I think -- and the Court is going to hear from Mr. Howard on what he perceives to be the conduct for which he accepts responsibility, which if this were a sentencing under a different statute, we'd find ourselves

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

having the Court to address, but I do want to -- I do want to remind the Court, I don't mean to say that in any sort of aggressive manner, but some of the comments that the Court made when it was rendering its decision regarding Mr. Howard's guilt in this case were along the lines that he loves that -- he loves that river. He cares about it. Lifelong time up there on that river. In fact, yes, Mr. Howard has been up there during the course of these proceedings which have gone on for well over a year. There has been no incident as to his behavior there other than the conduct in this case, and that -that, Your Honor, would be a condition of probation that I think would -- would really -- would really hurt. Not that probation isn't a matter of punishing, but when Ms. Biksacky says that otherwise the Defendant benefits from his actions in this case, Your Honor, any benefit you might identify that Mr. Howard has received, and he's fished there just like he has before, is far outweighed by what he's experienced being a Defendant in a federal criminal case, going to trial on it.

And you know, if you think about probation in this case, Mr. Howard has been on a non-reporting at least supervision by the probation office. I think Ms. -- I think Christina Snow is his supervising officer.

THE DEFENDANT: Right.

MR. VALENTINE: And without incident met all of the

conditions of that probation. So just in terms of putting in perspective this alleged benefit that he receives through his actions in this case are -- I think they are more than -- more than outweighed by the -- the negative and frankly disrupting experience it's to be a defendant in this matter before Your Honor. Not that he wasn't treated with respect and dignity as are all Defendants before Your Honor, but at the same time I don't perceive any benefit there.

As far as Mr. Howard goes and his respect, you know, this week and-a-half before our sentencing here last week and a little bit before that Mr. Howard was out west. What was he doing? He was visiting national parks. I think he went to three of them, one of them being Yellow Stone, and obviously no incidents that I am aware of. I suspect you can inquire of Mr. Howard whether or not there were, but he is somebody who has an appreciation, who has a respect for our -- our -- our national parks and for wildlife that are not -- that just don't evaporate looking at -- you know, we just can't -- can't ignore that and in an hour or so in the afternoon in August a couple years ago as something that is -- is not who Mr. Howard is, and it is not -- it's not -- isn't reflective of his -- of his appreciation of the national parks.

I submitted a sentencing memo. I don't think there is any genuine issue -- the initial sentence -- excuse me, the initial sentencing memorandum that I submitted said I think

Thanks.

some very positive things about Mr. Howard. Talked a little bit about his background, about his education, what he's done with his life, and what he is -- his family situation. I am not going to belabor that. His appreciation and respect for the environment, his activities but also his -- also his participation in organizations such as the Michigan Chapter of the Ruffed Grouse Society.

He's done the very same things up there, Your Honor, that you have done. He's kayaked that river. He has spent a lot of time in that area and is somebody who I think his actions over the course of his life indicate a respect and appreciation for — for the outdoors and for parks, the national parks in particular, that don't require the Court take any action to either disturb or to change in any way.

I think the Court has other sanctions. We expect a fine will be imposed in this matter. We expect that there may be other sanctions, but at the same time we would respectfully request that that bar from the national parks for somebody like Andy Howard not be imposed.

That's all I have. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Valentine.

MR. VALENTINE: I mean, I am willing to answer, of course, any questions you may have.

THE COURT: I actually have none, Mr. Valentine.

MR. VALENTINE: Thank you. 1 2 THE COURT: Mr. Howard, anything you'd like to say to me before I impose sentence on you? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 4 THE COURT: All right. If you would, sir, come to the 5 podium. 6 MR. VALENTINE: May I stand next to Mr. Howard at the 7 lectern? 8 THE COURT: Of course. Absolutely. 9 MR. VALENTINE: Thank you. 10 11 THE DEFENDANT: There is even water handy. First of all, I would like to thank you for the 12 opportunity to speak on my defense. 13 Your Honor, some of the comments you made in the court 14 transcription, page 158, line 1, Mr. Howard, your actions did, 15 in fact, damage the river. Remember the river was dredged in 16 that same location using massive equipment for 48 years. You 17 yourself enjoyed kayaking the Platte River and said you took 18 the long ride down the beach and enjoyed it. 19 On transcript page 153, line 7 through 11, you said, I 20 don't believe that the river could have been dredged by hand or 21 22 plastic shovels. A real shovel was involved. When my best 23 witnesses, Laura Collegia and Amy Roche, witnessed 15 teenagers dredging the river with photographic and video evidence. 24

I was curious, do you believe I was involved in any

25

way in diverting the river prior to 5:30 p.m. on August 15th?

THE COURT: Mr. Howard, we are not -- I am not going to get into a question and answer session with you. You are happy to tell me whatever you want to tell me.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: And I will listen.

THE CLERK: I accept responsibility for any of my actions in life but not for something I didn't do. My best efforts could not have stopped the new diversion of the river when I arrived. If my intent was to force the flow of the river back to the old river bed with my shovel and moving rocks, I could not have reversed the 20-foot wide raging current that I — that was occurring when I came down.

I wanted to run through to just really confirm the timeline of what occurred from our photo evidence in the court case. On Exhibit M that we presented on 2:27 p.m., we have the water just beginning to flow through the original trench that was dug.

On Exhibit L at 2:51 p.m., we have rock wing damns, huge rock wing damns, and you can see in the background the girl inner tubing down the new trench the river approximately six to eight feet wide.

On Exhibit P at 3:08 p.m., we have multiple children, teenagers, digging with their hands just as witnesses testified, working on the new diversion of the river. And note

the width of the flow and the power of the current in such a short timeline from 2:27 to 3:08.

Exhibit G, 4:03 p.m., the diverted river with kids digging as witnessed by Laura and Amy, again, with the rock damns. And Laura and Amy are even in the picture. Laura was with her daughter and friend from 9:00 a.m. throughout the entire day.

Exhibit N is 4:11 p.m. Again, I wanted to note the width and the amount of current.

And then Exhibit S -- pardon me, Exhibit O, is a kind of another picture of the newly diverted river with the level of current. All of this occurring before any witness said that I was even present.

And there even was I felt a misunderstanding in the case of the Frankfurt hardware receipt at 4:23 p.m., which I produced under the direction of my attorney, of an alibi of where I was at when I left the river at noon to clean my fish, and 4:23 with the drive time from Frankfurt back to the river would put me back there at around the 5:30 timeline, which was what was confirmed by several witnesses.

Not one witness said I was present during the initial diversion of the river. Rock wing damns were already present before Andrew Howard arrived. My actions after 5:30 p.m. were of no significance to the river outcome. I should not be paying for helicopter photos or environmental studies or be

banned from the park for something I didn't do.

From the court transcript governor witness Officer Balm. Witness seen me digging at 6:20 p.m.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Howard, these arguments I am sure will all be made to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals in Cincinnati and you are welcome to do that. We are not going to rehash the whole trial here --

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: -- and argue about your conviction. If there is anything you wish to say to me on the issue of your sentencing, happy to listen. Otherwise, we are going to move on.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. I'd like to give one example of what I felt would be a comparative act, example to my actions. I think it could be compared to someone saying they are going to buy a knife and kill someone and leave the location and buy a knife and come back five hours later to find the person I was going to kill laying on the ground stabbed to death. Then law enforcement arrives and sees me standing over the dead body with a knife accusing me of the murder, when the man I came upon was already dead. My actions were of no consequence and would not have changed the outcome.

So my request to you in sentencing would be to listen to my perspective of the amount of damage or involvement that I had. My statements of what I was going to do looked terrible.

My being down there with a shovel was terrible. And I read your comments in the transcript through three times, and I felt I was pretty impressed actually with the balanced thoughts that you had on both sides of the issue, but I felt that the level of penalty -- even though, yes, I was digging in the new trench, I think the level of penalty that the government is seeking is too heavy for the amount of damage that occurred from my arrival.

been there in broad daylight standing out there. Some of the witnesses said I was very relaxed, and I felt that in the transcript that there — that you may have misinterpreted me saying I really dodged a ticket. My comment to the witness that I really dodged a ticket, it was Kurt Walbey, wasn't that I got away with a crime. It was that I was fortunate. I was actually thanking God that I came down after someone else diverted the river and it was opened up. Because my intentions were bad. But I didn't feel that I dodged a ticket because I knew I was down there committing a crime. If I thought I was committing a crime and the river was already opened up I would have put that shovel over my shoulder and been running back to the car.

THE COURT: Mr. Howard, I am not sure you are helping yourself on appeal with your comments now, so I would just suggest if there is other things you want to say maybe run them

past Mr. Valentine --1 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. 2 THE COURT: -- first and I am happy to listen. 3 Otherwise, time to move on. 4 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. 5 THE COURT: I don't want you to harm your case moving 6 forward, and I am not sure -- I am concerned that you may be 7 doing that in some way, so you may be seated. 8 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. 9 THE COURT: Ms. Biksacky, I neglected to ask whether 10 there were any victims present who want to speak? 11 MS. BIKSACKY: We do have representatives from the 12 13 National Park Service present, Your Honor. However, they will not be giving any victim statement. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 15 It's my duty to impose a sentence sufficient but 16 not --17 Your Honor, I apologize. MS. BIKSACKY: 18 THE COURT: Yes. 19 MS. BIKSACKY: Ms. Johnson has instructed me that 20 there is one procedural aspect that she would like to address 21 22 before the Court issues its ruling. 23 THE COURT: Okay. MS. JOHNSON: Yes, Your Honor. I just wanted to note, 24 because if you impose restitution it would be under a term of 25

probation, and so the payment term, if you impose restitution, needs to be over the term of probation because restitution wouldn't exist beyond probation. So if you impose restitution make sure the payment schedule it is over -- its long enough that it covers the whole term of the payment schedule. The probationary term.

THE COURT: Well, I am not sure that's possible and yet reasonable. I mean, the government -- if I put Mr. Howard on probation, and order him to pay restitution -- I mean, when his term of -- you are saying when his term of probation expires it extinguishes his obligation to pay the rest of the restitution? Is that what you're saying?

MS. JOHNSON: That's correct, Your Honor. If you impose it under that statute it's only for the term of probation, and so you could have unsupervised probation, it just needs to be -- if you are imposing restitution as a term of that probation, it needs to be concurrent with that term. You can impose it due and payable immediately, and then, you know, we could establish something separate, but you're -- it's only due during his probationary period.

THE COURT: By something separate you mean you could, through Mr. Howard's counsel, work out some kind of payment schedule? Is that what you are saying.

MS. JOHNSON: Sure. Yeah. I mean, that's possible as well, but I just wanted you to know that the payment term is --

the funds are only due during a term of probation. 1 THE COURT: Well, I appreciate you telling me that 2 because I didn't know that. 3 Mr. Valentine, any thoughts on that subject? 4 MR. VALENTINE: Well, Your Honor, as we indicated in 5 our memo, we don't think restitution is appropriate under the 6 Mandatory Victim's Restitution Act. 7 THE COURT: Right, and I agree with you on that. 8 MR. VALENTINE: Or the --9 THE COURT: Well, I don't agree with you. I am not 10 11 ruling on the MVRA. MR. VALENTINE: Got you. I mean, yes, Your Honor. 12 The second thing is that we don't think restitution is 13 appropriate under the probation statute that the government has 14 indicated it wants probation to be imposed under either for the 15 reasons that we indicated in our submission. Thank you. 16 THE COURT: Understood. Okay. 17 Well, Ms. Johnson, you have thrown a monkey wrench 18 into my work, so it's better to figure it out now then have to 19 deal with it later. All right. We are going to take a short 20 pause. Can I see Officer Jabour in chambers, and we'll come 21 22 back out here in the very near future. 23 THE CLERK: All rise, please. Court is in recess. 24 (Recess taken, 2:32 p.m.) (Resume Proceeding, 2:41 p.m.) 25

THE CLERK: Court is back in session. Please be seated.

THE COURT: All right. We're back on the record. I think I have a way to impose the sentence I intended to impose by adjusting some of the terms.

So back to where I was. It's my duty to impose a sentence sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes of sentencing set forth in 18 United States Code § 3553(a). I have considered all non-frivolous arguments in support of a request for a lower sentence. I have considered the 3553 factors, including the nature and circumstances of this offense, the history and characteristics of the Defendant. Mr. Howard has never been convicted of a crime as far as I know. To reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for law, provide just punishment, afford adequate deterrence to Mr. Howard and others, and the kinds of sentences available.

The Platte River was carved out between 10 and 20 thousand years ago by the Lake Michigan lobe of the great continental glacier that covered much of North America. It's 30 miles long. It's powerful. It dumps about 3.3 million gallons of water per hour into Lake Michigan. The fact that the course of this beautiful and ancient river could be altered with a common garden shovel is a stark illustration of how fragile the natural world can be and underscores how important

the mission of the National Park Service to protect and preserve our natural spaces for the benefits of all Americans really is.

Mr. Howard, I am placing you on probation for a term of 60 months. While on probation you will be subject to mandatory conditions of probation, which include that you not commit a crime, which I have no expectation that you will. You can't unlawfully use or possess any controlled substance, including marijuana. I don't know if you do or not but you can't. And there are other conditions that Officer Jabour — who will be your probation officer is here in court. When we are finished you will go down to the first floor and meet with him. He'll get you set up on probation, and he'll go over the other mandatory conditions.

There are standard conditions. You report to him as directed. You are truthful -- you truthfully answer questions put to you by him. You are not to communicate or interact with someone you know is engaged in criminal activity. I -- I don't expect that of you. And there are a lot of other conditions. Again, Officer Jabour will go over those with you.

I am also imposing additional special conditions and those include a ban from entering onto National Park Service property anywhere in the United States. So actually, I was glad to hear that you have been to Yellow Stone. There are more than 400 such properties I believe around the United

States. It's going to be incumbent upon you wherever you are to know the boundaries and to stay off of those properties.

The parties agree that I can impose restitution as a condition of probation. Mr. Valentine has made arguments in his extensive briefings about foreseeability and causation, that I make those part of my analysis, and foreseeability of the damage. And there is no question that you foresaw the damage because you told the officer you came down there intending to cut open that channel. So not only could you foresee it, but you intended it. And the evidence was clear that you aided in the causation of that. You were seen digging in the trench. You were seen moving rocks onto the wing damns to help channel the water out through that cut through the sand.

Mr. Valentine also argued eloquently that there was no remediation here. In other words, ultimately the park service decided not to attempt to restore that section of lake shore back to its original condition, and the government, I think, phrased that as the windfall argument. I am not going to call it that, but I will say this. The park service did a study. That's exactly what anyone should expect to happen under those circumstances. The damage has been done. The first thing you do is assess the damage and figure out what to do about it. What can be done about it? And ultimately the park service decided that attempting to put the river back in its original

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

course would require heavy equipment and that the risk that that process posed to the environment would only have exacerbated and multiplied the damage done by opening the original trench, and so it elected not to do that. And I'll say this, Mr. Howard, I think if they had decided to do it, we'd be talking about a restitution number probably in the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

I know you are upset because you feel like you are getting tagged for the whole amount of restitution, and you are. Federal law provides for that. There are cases cited by the government in its brief. I am sure that Mr. Valentine has looked at those cases. I would just say including U.S. v Church. What do I have here? 731 F3 530. And also an unpublished case U.S. v Buchanan, 2023 Westlaw 5352223, which address these issues. And you know, it's simply the fact that at times crimes are committed, damage is done, not all the perpetrators are caught, but those that are caught are held responsible for the entire amount of the damage because the law -- we as a society through the law say it shouldn't be the victim who bears the cost. If there is an inordinate cost to be born here, and we have only got one of the three people who did the crime, that person should bear the cost. That's a decision that's been made in the law for a long time. And although I understand your feelings, they are unfounded.

So I am going to order -- include as a special

condition that you also pay restitution in the amount of \$22,472.22 payable in equal monthly installments of \$500 per month beginning 30 days from the entry of this judgment.

Also, I am ordering you to pay the costs of proceedings in the amount of \$3,947.71 to be paid in full within 30 days from the entry of judgment, and a mandatory special assessment of \$10.

Now, Mr. Howard, this is not exactly the sentence I intended to impose, but I want to make sure the restitution is paid. So if the restitution is paid in full on or before the end of the 24th month of your probation, which begins at the entry of judgment, I will consider an early termination of your probation, and if you have also been in compliance with the other conditions, so you have stayed out of the national park lands and haven't run afoul of any of the other conditions, and you have paid the restitution, I'll consider terminating your probation at the end of 24 months as opposed to 60.

Any objections to the sentence imposed not previously raised, Ms. Biksacky?

MS. JOHNSON: Your Honor, the United States would just reserve its arguments with respect to mandatory restitution.

THE COURT: Sure.

Mr. Valentine?

MR. VALENTINE: I am confused. I am not sure what -- what that means.

THE COURT: I'll tell you what I think it means, which 1 2 maybe isn't determinative here, but what I think it means is the United States is reserving its right to appeal my decision 3 not to impose restitution under the MVRA. 4 MR. VALENTINE: All right. 5 THE COURT: Am I correct? 6 MS. JOHNSON: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Okay. 8 MR. VALENTINE: All right. Well, that's fine, and I 9 understand it now, too. 10 11 The other thing, though, Your Honor, is that I think you may have indicated that the parties agree on restitution 12 under the probation statute. 13 THE COURT: Well, the parties agree that I can impose 14 restitution. I didn't mean to suggest you agreed on the 15 amount. 16 MR. VALENTINE: We don't agree that you can impose 17 restitution under that statute, and I can --18 THE COURT: Well, in your filing, Mr. Valentine, 19 20 surreply to government's reply brief ECF 25, at page ID 480, "The government replies by stating that restitution can be 21 22 ordered under a different sentencing statute. The Defendant 23 agrees that restitution under that statute will be in the

MR. VALENTINE: Okay. Well then --

Court's discretion." The footnote.

24

25

THE COURT: And you can change your position. I was just relying on the position stated in your brief.

MR. VALENTINE: And -- and our position would be that the Court would be abusing its discretion under that statute and that it wasn't appropriate, and I'll read what I stated in that memo as well as the prior memo --

THE COURT: Absolutely fair.

MR. VALENTINE: -- and felt that that was something we objected to.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. VALENTINE: And therefore, I guess I need to say, and as much as this is a sentence under the sentence reform act, that whether or not it is, that we object to the Court's disposition of the issues they raised that were decided against us. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Valentine.

All right. Anything else -- Mr. Howard, I am obligated to notify you of your right to appeal both your conviction and sentence. You have the right to appeal your conviction and the right to appeal a sentence you believe was illegally or incorrectly imposed. If you cannot afford to pay the costs of an appeal, you have the right to apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis and the clerk of the Court will prepare and file a notice of appeal upon your request. Any notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of entry of this

judgment, which is likely to happen in the next day or so. 1 Ms. Biksacky, anything else? 2 MS. BIKSACKY: Nothing further from the government. 3 Thank you. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Valentine? 5 MR. VALENTINE: Nothing, Your Honor. Thank you. 6 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Howard, I hope to see you 7 in 24 months and to be terminating your successful term of 8 probation. 9 MR. VALENTINE: May I be heard on one thing, Your 10 Honor, and that is that we did raise in our reply brief the 11 issue under whether -- under the probation statute that the 12 Court is referring to in imposing restitution that the same 13 issues of but for, directly and proximately caused and 14 reasonably foreseeable were issues that the Court could not 15 conclude existed --16 THE COURT: Yes. You did. And I thought I had 17 addressed those in my remarks. 18 MR. VALENTINE: You have ruled on it. I just didn't 19 want the record to reflect that somehow we thought that, well, 20 accept for the amount --21 22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 MR. VALENTINE: Except for the amount, that the -- the only thing under the probation statute restitution would be the 24 amount, but no, no, we believe that it was inappropriate 25

```
for causation reasons as well for the Court -- inappropriate
1
         for the Court -- pursuant to causation reasons, for the Court
2
         to order restitution under that statute. Thank you.
3
                   THE COURT: You are welcome. All right. We'll be
 4
         adjourned.
 5
                   THE CLERK: All rise, please.
 6
                   (Proceeding concluded, 2:55 p.m.)
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Paul G. Brandell, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the within entitled and numbered cause on the date hereinbefore set forth; and I do further certify that the foregoing transcript has been prepared by me or under my direction.

/s/ Paul G. Brandell

Paul G. Brandell, CSR-4552, RPR, CRR U.S. District Court Reporter 399 Federal Building

Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503